



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/917,675	07/31/2001	Surendra Goel	06975-194001	1183

26171 7590 10/24/2003

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
1425 K STREET, N.W.
11TH FLOOR
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3500

EXAMINER

FLEURANTIN, JEAN B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2172

DATE MAILED: 10/24/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/917,675

Applicant(s)

GOEL ET AL.

Examiner

Jean B Fleurantin

Art Unit

2172

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 July 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3,4.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2172

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is in response to the application filed on July 31, 2001, in which claims 1-38 are presented for examination.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement filed on December 06, 2001 and January 01, 2002, comply with the provisions of MPEP 609. It has been placed in the application file. The information referred to therein has been considered as to merits.

Drawings

3. The drawings in this application are objected to by the Draftsperson as informal, under 37 CFR 1.84 or 1.152 for the reasons as indicated in PTO-948.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,987,446 issued to Corey et al. (hereinafter "Corey").

Art Unit: 2172

As per claim 1, Corey discloses an analogous system that teaches an information retrieval system, which includes a plurality of text engines based on substantially different computational searching techniques. Corey states by activating each search engine with input from a user information request, the output from each of the search engine is combined into a single list information items.

In particular, Corey discloses the claimed limitations "receiving a single query that includes at least one search term" as a means of allowing a user to input a query for a desired information, (col. 5, lines 10-15);

"comparing the received search term automatically in response to the single query with indexed electronic content that is stored on a local device to derive a first result" as to distribute a user query to each of the search engines (col. 5, lines 15-21), transform the user query into queries acceptable to the various search engines, wherein the input query input interface module outputs these queries to their corresponding search engine controllers (col. 5, lines 27-34), upon receiving the commands, the search engine performs the search on the term lookup database in order to satisfy the query input (col. 5, lines 42-62) and "comparing the received search term with electronic content that is stored on a remote device to derive a second result" as to distribute a user query to each of the search engines (col. 5, lines 15-21), transform the user query into queries acceptable to the various search engine, wherein the input query input interface module outputs these queries to their corresponding search engine controllers (col. 5, lines 27-34), upon receiving the commands, the search engine performs the search on the term lookup database in order to satisfy the query input, (col. 5, lines 42-62; col. 6, lines 9-23), Applicant should duly

Art Unit: 2172

note that before generating a query result, the search engine has to compare the user query terms with the information data or search terms stored in the database (item 42);

“combining the first result and the second result into an amalgamated result” as outputting from each of the search engine each reference that contains the information desired by the user (col. 6, lines 50-56) and generating a single, combined ranked list of information item from at least the highest ranked, (col. 6, lines 56-62); and

“displaying the amalgamated result” as a means of displaying to the user the information items, (col. 6, lines 62- 67; col. 7, lines 1-12).

As per claim 2, Corey discloses wherein the local device includes a personal computing device, which is the database device, (see Corey’s figure 1, item 42).

As per claim 3, Corey states that upon receiving the commands, the search engine performs the search on the term lookup database in order to satisfy the query input, (see col. 5, lines 42-62; col. 6, lines 9-23); therefore Corey reads on the claimed features “wherein comparing the received search term includes simultaneously comparing the received search term with the indexed electronic content stored on the local device and the electronic content stored on the remote device.”

As per claim 4, Corey discloses “wherein the amalgamated result is displayed without indicating whether the amalgamated result was derived from the first result or the second result”

Art Unit: 2172

as a means of displaying to the user the information items, (see col. 6, lines 62- 67; col. 7, lines 1-12).

As per claim 5, Corey states that upon receiving a command, search engine performs the search on the term lookup database in order to satisfy the query input (see col. 5, lines 42-62; col. 6, lines 9-23); therefore Corey reads on the claimed features “wherein comparing the received search term includes comparing based on a single input action by a user.”

As per claim 6, Corey states that upon receiving a command, search engine performs the search on the term lookup database in order to satisfy the query input (see col. 5, lines 42-62; col. 7, lines 8-23); therefore Corey reads on the claimed features “wherein comparing the receiving search term automatically in response to the single input action by the user includes performing a first comparison of the received search term with the indexed electronic content stored on the local device and a separate time, performing a second comparison of the received search term with the electronic content stored on the remote device.”

As per claim 7, Corey discloses “wherein comparing against content stored on the local device and content stored on the remote device based on a single action received from a user is performed automatically in a default state such that the user need not pre-select to compare the received search term with both the indexed electronic content stored on the local device and the electronic content stored on the remote device” as a means of receiving commands and query data from the literal search engine controller 34 and performs a search on the search term lookup

Art Unit: 2172

data base 42 for determining references or indexes to information items that satisfy the query input to the literal search engine 14, more particularly the literal search engine 14 may be viewed as a substantially conventional text string matching search engine that is designed for searching a data base, (see col. 5, lines 43-56).

As per claim 8, Corey discloses “wherein comparing against content stored on the local device and content stored on the remote device based on a single action received from a user is performed with the user pre-selecting to compare the received search term with both the indexed electronic content stored on the local device and the electronic content stored on the remote device” as upon receiving the commands, the search engine performs the search on the term lookup database in order to satisfy the query input, (col. 5, lines 29-42; col. 7, lines 8-23).

As per claim 10, Corey discloses “creating an index based on the electronic content stored on the local device, wherein comparing the received search term includes comparing the received search term with the index” as upon receiving the commands, the search engine performs the search on the term lookup database in order to satisfy the query input, (col. 5, lines 29-42; col. 7, lines 8-23).

As per claim 11, Corey discloses “wherein creating the index includes creating the index at an event pre-designated by a user of the local device” as upon receiving commands and query data from the literal search engine controller 34, in which performs a search on the search term

Art Unit: 2172

lookup data base 42 for determining references or indexes to information items that satisfy the query input to the literal search engine 14, (see col. 5, lines 43-48).

As per claim 12, Corey discloses “wherein creating the index includes creating the index on-demand in response to an action by a user of the local device” as a means of performing a search on the search term lookup data base 42 for determining references or indexes to information items that satisfy the query input to the literal search engine 14, (see col. 5, lines 45-48).

As per claim 13, Corey discloses “creating an inverted index based on the electronic content stored on the local device” (see col. 6, lines 17-23), “wherein comparing the received search term includes comparing the received search term with the inverted index” as a means of receiving commands and query data from the literal search engine controller 34, performs a search on the search term lookup database 42 for determining references or indexes to information items that satisfy the query input to the literal search engine 14, the literal search engine 14 may be viewed as a substantially conventional text string matching search engine that is designed for searching a data base, (see col. 5, lines 43-51).

As per claim 14, Corey discloses “creating an index based on the electronic content stored on the remote device” (see col. 6, lines 17-23), “wherein comparing the received search term includes comparing the received search term with the index” as a means of receiving commands and query data from the literal search engine controller 34, performs a search on the

Art Unit: 2172

search term lookup database 42 for determining references or indexes to information items that satisfy the query input to the literal search engine 14, the literal search engine 14 may be viewed as a substantially conventional text string matching search engine that is designed for searching a data base, (see col. 5, lines 43-51).

As per claim 15, Corey discloses “creating an index based on the electronic content stored on the remote device” (see col. 6, lines 17-23), “wherein comparing the received search term includes comparing the received search term with the index” as a means of receiving commands and query data from the literal search engine controller 34, performs a search on the search term lookup database 42 for determining references or indexes to information items that satisfy the query input to the literal search engine 14, the literal search engine 14 may be viewed as a substantially conventional text string matching search engine that is designed for searching a data base, (see col. 5, lines 43-51).

As per claim 16, Corey discloses “creating a local inverted index based on the electronic content stored on the remote device” (see col. 6, lines 17-23), “wherein comparing the received search term includes comparing the received search term with the local inverted index” as a means for receiving commands and query data from the literal search engine controller 34, performs a search on the search term lookup database 42 for determining references or indexes to information items that satisfy the query input to the literal search engine 14, the literal search engine 14 may be viewed as a substantially conventional text string matching search engine that is designed for searching a data base, (see col. 5, lines 43-51).

Art Unit: 2172

As per claim 17, Corey discloses “wherein comparing the received search term includes performing a single comparison of the received search term with both the indexed electronic content stored on the local device and the electronic content stored on the remote device” as a means of receiving commands and query data from the literal search engine controller 34, performs a search on the search term lookup database 42 for determining references or indexes to information items that satisfy the query input to the literal search engine 14, the literal search engine 14 may be viewed as a substantially conventional text string matching search engine that is designed for searching a data base, (see col. 5, lines 43-51).

As per claim 18, Corey discloses “in response to an action of a user of the local device, designating at least one type of indexed electronic content stored on the local device for comparison with the received search term” as a means of receiving commands and query data from the literal search engine controller 34 reforms a search on the search term lookup database 42 for determining references or indexes to information items that satisfy the query input to the literal search engine 14, more particularly the literal search engine 14 may be viewed as a substantially conventional text string matching search engine that is designed for searching a database, (see col. 5, lines 43-51).

As per claim 19, Corey discloses “in response to an action of a user of the local device, designating at least one file location of the indexed electronic content a stored on the local device for comparison with the received search term” as a means of receiving commands and query data

Art Unit: 2172

from the literal search engine controller 34 reforms a search on the search term lookup database 42 for determining references or indexes to information items that satisfy the query input to the literal search engine 14, more particularly the literal search engine 14 may be viewed as a substantially conventional text string matching search engine that is designed for searching a database, (see col. 5, lines 43-51).

As per claim 20, Corey discloses an analogous system that teaches an information retrieval system, which includes a plurality of text engines based on substantially different computational searching techniques. Corey states by activating each search engine with input from a user information request, the output from each of the search engine is combined into a single list information items.

In particular, Corey discloses the claimed limitations “a receiving code segment that causes the computer to receive a single query that includes at least one search term” as a means of allowing a user to input a query for a desired information, (col. 5, lines 10-15);

“a comparing code segment that causes the computer to compare the received search term automatically in response to the single query with indexed electronic content that is stored on a local device to derive a first result” as to distribute a user query to each of the search engines (col. 5, lines 15-21), transform the user query into queries acceptable to the various search engines, wherein the input query input interface module outputs these queries to their corresponding search engine controllers (col. 5, lines 27-34), upon receiving the commands, the search engine performs the search on the term lookup database in order to satisfy the query input (col. 5, lines 42-62) and “comparing the received search term with electronic content that is

Art Unit: 2172

stored on a remote device to derive a second result” as to distribute a user query to each of the search engines (col. 5, lines 15-21), transform the user query into queries acceptable to the various search engine, wherein the input query input interface module outputs these queries to their corresponding search engine controllers (col. 5, lines 27-34), upon receiving the commands, the search engine performs the search on the term lookup database in order to satisfy the query input, (col. 5, lines 42-62; col. 6, lines 9-23);

“a combining code segment that causes the computer to combine the first result and the second result into an amalgamated result” as outputting from each of the search engine each reference that contains the information desired by the user (col. 6, lines 50-56) and generating a single, combined ranked list of information item from at least the highest ranked (col. 6, lines 56-62); and

“a displaying code segment that causes the computer to display the amalgamated result” as a means of displaying to the user the information items (col. 6, lines 62- 67; col. 7, lines 1-12). Applicant should duly note that before generating a query result, the search engine has to compare the user query terms with the information data stored in the database (item 42).

As per claim 21, Corey discloses wherein the local device includes a personal computing device, which is the database device (see Corey’s figure 1, item 42).

As per claim 22, Corey states that upon receiving the commands, the search engine performs the search on the term lookup database in order to satisfy the query input (see col. 5, lines 42-62; col. 6, lines 9-23); therefore Corey reads on the claimed features “wherein the

Art Unit: 2172

comparing code segment causes the computer to simultaneously compare the received search term with the indexed electronic content stored on the local device and the electronic content stored on the remote device.”

As per claim 23, Corey discloses, “wherein the amalgamated result is displayed without indicating whether the amalgamated result was derived from the first result or the second result” as a means of displaying to the user the information items, (see col. 6, lines 62- 67; col. 7, lines 1-12).

As per claim 24, Corey states that upon receiving a command, search engine performs the search on the term lookup database in order to satisfy the query input (see col. 5, lines 42-62; col. 6, lines 9-23); therefore Corey reads on the claimed features “wherein the comparing code segment causes the computer to compare based on a single input action by a user.”

As per claim 25, Corey states that upon receiving a command, search engine performs the search on the term lookup database in order to satisfy the query input (see col. 5, lines 42-62; col. 7, lines 8-23); therefore Corey reads on the claimed features “wherein the comparing code segment causes the computer to perform a first comparison of the received search term with the indexed electronic content stored on the local device and, a separate time, perform a second comparison of the received search term with the electronic content stored on the remote device.”

Art Unit: 2172

As per claim 26, Corey discloses “wherein comparing the comparing code segment that causes the computer to compare against content stored on the local device and content stored on the remote device based on a single action received from a user is causes the computer to perform automatically in a default state such that the user need not pre-select to compare the received search term with both the indexed electronic content stored on the local device and the electronic content stored on the remote device” as a means of receiving commands and query data from the literal search engine controller 34 and performs a search on the search term lookup data base 42 for determining references or indexes to information items that satisfy the query input to the literal search engine 14, more particularly the literal search engine 14 may be viewed as a substantially conventional text string matching search engine that is designed for searching a data base, (see col. 5, lines 43-56).

As per claim 27, Corey discloses “wherein the comparing code segment that causes the computer to compare against content stored on the local device and content stored on the remote device based on a single action received from a user causes the computer to perform with the user pre-selecting to compare the received search term with both the indexed electronic content stored on the local device and the electronic content stored on the remote device” as upon receiving the commands, the search engine performs the search on the term lookup database in order to satisfy the query input, (col. 5, lines 29-42; col. 7, lines 8-23).

As per claim 29, Corey discloses “an index creating code segment causes the computer to create an index based on the electronic content stored on the local device, wherein comparing the

Art Unit: 2172

received search term includes comparing the received search term with the index” as upon receiving the commands, the search engine performs the search on the term lookup database in order to satisfy the query input, (col. 5, lines 29-42; col. 7, lines 8-23).

As per claim 30, Corey discloses “wherein creating the index creating the code segment causes the computer to create the index at an event pre-designated by a user of the local device” as upon receiving commands and query data from the literal search engine controller 34, in which performs a search on the search term lookup data base 42 for determining references or indexes to information items that satisfy the query input to the literal search engine 14, (see col. 5, lines 43-48).

As per claim 31, Corey discloses “wherein the index creating code segment causes the computer to create the index on-demand in response to an action by a user of the local device” as a means of performing a search on the search term lookup data base 42 for determining references or indexes to information items that satisfy the query input to the literal search engine 14, (see col. 5, lines 45-48).

As per claim 32, Corey discloses “an index creating code segment that causes the computer to create an inverted index based on the electronic content stored on the local device” (see col. 6, lines 17-23), “wherein comparing code segment causes the computer to compare the received search term with the inverted index” as a means of receiving commands and query data from the literal search engine controller 34, performs a search on the search term lookup

Art Unit: 2172

database 42 for determining references or indexes to information items that satisfy the query input to the literal search engine 14, the literal search engine 14 may be viewed as a substantially conventional text string matching search engine that is designed for searching a data base, (see col. 5, lines 43-51).

As per claim 33, Corey discloses “an index creating code segment that causes the computer to create an index based on the electronic content stored on the remote device” (see col. 6, lines 17-23), “wherein the comparing code segment causes the computer to compare the received search term with the index” as a means of receiving commands and query data from the literal search engine controller 34, performs a search on the search term lookup database 42 for determining references or indexes to information items that satisfy the query input to the literal search engine 14, the literal search engine 14 may be viewed as a substantially conventional text string matching search engine that is designed for searching a data base, (see col. 5, lines 43-51).

As per claim 34, Corey discloses “a local index creating code segment that causes the computer to create a local index based on the electronic content stored on the remote device” (see col. 6, lines 17-23), “wherein comparing code segment causes the computer to compare the received search term with the local index” as a means of receiving commands and query data from the literal search engine controller 34, performs a search on the search term lookup database 42 for determining references or indexes to information items that satisfy the query input to the literal search engine 14, the literal search engine 14 may be viewed as a substantially

Art Unit: 2172

conventional text string matching search engine that is designed for searching a data base, (see col. 5, lines 43-51).

As per claim 35, Corey discloses “a local index creating code that causes the computer to create a local inverted index based on the electronic content stored on the remote device” (see col. 6, lines 17-23), “wherein the comparing code segment causes the computer to compare the received search term with the local inverted index” as a means for receiving commands and query data from the literal search engine controller 34, performs a search on the search term lookup database 42 for determining references or indexes to information items that satisfy the query input to the literal search engine 14, the literal search engine 14 may be viewed as a substantially conventional text string matching search engine that is designed for searching a data base, (see col. 5, lines 43-51).

As per claim 36, Corey discloses “wherein comparing code segment causes the computer to perform a single comparison of the received search term with both the indexed electronic content stored on the local device and the electronic content stored on the remote device” as a means of receiving commands and query data from the literal search engine controller 34, performs a search on the search term lookup database 42 for determining references or indexes to information items that satisfy the query input to the literal search engine 14, the literal search engine 14 may be viewed as a substantially conventional text string matching search engine that is designed for searching a data base, (see col. 5, lines 43-51).

Art Unit: 2172

As per claim 37, Corey discloses “in response to an action of a user of the local device, designating code segment that causes the computer designate at least one type of indexed electronic content stored on the local device for comparison with the received search term” as a means of receiving commands and query data from the literal search engine controller 34 reforms a search on the search term lookup database 42 for determining references or indexes to information items that satisfy the query input to the literal search engine fourteen, more particularly the literal search engine fourteen may be viewed as a substantially conventional text string matching search engine that is designed for searching a database, (see col. 5, lines 43-51).

As per claim 38, Corey discloses “in response to an action of a user of the local device, designating code segment that causes the computer to designate at least one file location of the indexed electronic content a stored on the local device for comparison with the received search term” as a means of receiving commands and query data from the literal search engine controller 34 reforms a search on the search term lookup database 42 for determining references or indexes to information items that satisfy the query input to the literal search engine 14, more particularly the literal search engine 14 may be viewed as a substantially conventional text string matching search engine that is designed for searching a database, (see col. 5, lines 43-51).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S.

Patent No. 5,987,446 issued to Corey et al. (hereinafter "Corey").

As per claim 9, Corey discloses "wherein comparing the received search term includes comparing the received search term, in response to the single query, with indexed electronic content stored on a first local device and with indexed electronic content stored on a second local device" as upon receiving the commands, the search engine performs the search on the term lookup database in order to satisfy the query input, (col. 5, lines 29-42; col. 7, lines 8-23). Corey does not explicitly disclose the use of networking the first local and second local device using a local area network (LAN). It is well known in the art that LAN is a group of computers or nodes that are connected by a cable or a telephone line through which messages are transmitted. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Corey's system by utilizing the telephone network as described by Corey, (see col. 23, lines 18-21) in order to connect the literal search engine (item 34) with the semantic similarity search engine (item 38), and to improve the accuracy and the reliability of the enabling a search for both local remote electronic content, thereby enabling one device to interact with other on the network.

Art Unit: 2172

As per claim 28, Corey discloses “wherein the comparing code segment causes the computer to compare the received search term, in response to the single query, with indexed electronic content stored on a first local device and with indexed electronic content stored on a second local device” as upon receiving the commands, the search engine performs the search on the term lookup database in order to satisfy the query input, (col. 5, lines 29-42; col. 7, lines 8-23). Corey does not explicitly disclose the use of networking the first local and second local device using a local area network (LAN). It is well known in the art that LAN is a group of computers or nodes that are connected by a cable or a telephone line through which messages are transmitted. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Corey’s system by utilizing the telephone network as described by Corey, (see col. 23, lines 18-21) in order to connect the literal search engine (item 34) with the semantic similarity search engine (item 38), and to improve the accuracy and the reliability of the enabling a search for both local remote electronic content, thereby enabling one device to interact with other on the network.

Prior Art

6. The prior art of record and not relied on upon is considered pertinent to applicant’s disclosure. Guha U.S. Patent No. 6,081,805 relates to remove duplicate query results.

Art Unit: 2172

Contact Information

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication from examiner should be directed to Jean Bolte Fleurantin at (703) 308-6718. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30 A.M. to 6:00 P.M.

If any attempt to reach the examiner by telephone is unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mrs. KIM VU can be reached at (703) 305-8449. The FAX phone numbers for the Group 2100 Customer Service Center are: *After Final* (703) 746-7238, *Official* (703) 746-7239, and *Non-Official* (703) 746-7240. NOTE: Documents transmitted by facsimile will be entered as official documents on the file wrapper unless clearly marked "***DRAFT***".

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group 2100 Customer Service Center receptionist whose telephone numbers are (703) 306-5631, (703) 306-5632, (703) 306-5633.



Jean Bolte Fleurantin

October 13, 2003

JBF/